DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 276 IR 053 436

AUTHOR Pickard, Patricia White
TITLE The Instructional Consultant Role of the School Library Media Specialist: A Research Study.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 95p.; Specialist in Education Study Georgia State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classification; Consultants; Course Integrated Library Instruction; *Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Design; Learning Resources Centers; Library Surveys; *Media Specialists; *School Libraries; Standards; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS DeKalb School District GA; *Instructional Consultant Role; Instructional Support; Librarian Teacher Cooperation

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if a lag existed between the theoretical instructional role of design and consultation as described in library literature and standards and the instructional role practiced by school library media specialists. The population for this study was the 128 library media specialists of the DeKalb County Public Schools (Georgia). A three-page questionnaire was developed containing 18 taxonomy and taxonomy-related statements describing different aspects of the instructional role. The subjects rated the role statements as to their perceived importance and to the extent of practice. Frequencies and percentages of the responses were analyzed to answer the research questions. Responses were received from 65% of the participants. The results of this study indicate that there is a discrepancy between the theoretical instructional role of design and consultation and the instructional role being practiced by the DeKalb school library media specialists. Even though the data showed that the majority of the respondents perceived the instructional role as important or very important, less than 10% indicated that they practiced the role to a great or very great extent. Further study is needed to determine why more media specialists are not practicing the role and to determine ways to increase the practice of the instructional role mandated by the standards for school library specialists. Copies of the survey questionnaire, the Library Media Specialist's Taxonomy, the cover letter, the Loertscher Taxonomy, and respondents' comments from the questionnaire are appended. (49 references) (Author/MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328276

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Instructional Consultant Role of the School Library Media Specialist: A Research Study

by
Patricia White Pickard

IR053434

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia W. Pickard
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONSULTANT ROLE OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST: A RESEARCH STUDY

by

PATRICIA WHITE PICKARD

A SCHOLARLY STUDY

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
for the Degree of Specialist in Education in
Library Media Technology in the Department
of Curriculum and Instruction
in the College of Education
Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia

1990

ABSTRACT

THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONSULTANT ROLE OF THE
SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA SPECIALIST:
A RESEARCH STUDY
by
PATRICIA WHITE PICKARD

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine if a lag existed between the theoretical instructional role of design and consultation as described in library literature and standards and the instructional role practiced by school library media specialists.

Methods and Procedures

The population for this study was the 128 library media specialists of the DeKalb County Public Schools, DeKalb County, Georgia. A three-page questionnaire was developed containing 18 taxonomy and taxonomy-related statements describing different aspects of the instructional role. The subjects rated the role statements as to perceived importance and to extent of practice. Frequencies and percentages of the responses were analyzed to answer the research questions.

Results

Responses were received from 65% of the DeKalb library media specialists. Major findings included:

1. The taxonomy statements defining the instructional role of participation in planning, implementing, and evaluating resource-based units with classroom teachers were rated important or very important by at least 77.1% of the respondents, while the taxonomy-related statement concerning the equal partnership with the teacher in grading the students in a resource-based unit was rated important or very important by only 26.5%.

2. The practice ratings of all the taxonomy and taxonomy-related statements were lower than the ratings for importance with the largest discrepancies (40.9% to 62.7%) appearing in the taxonomy statements which define and describe the instructional role, including serving on the school curriculum committee.

3. No common demographic variables were found among all the respondents who gave the highest ratings for perceived importance and practice to the taxonomy statements

defining the instructional role. However, the greater percentage of secondary media specialists (76.5%) than elementary media specialists (53.2%) gave the highest ratings to the taxonomy statements for perceived importance of the instructional role.

Conclusions

The results of this study indicate that there was a discrepancy between the theoretical instructional role of design and consultation and the instructional role being practiced by the DeKalb school library media specialists. Even though the data showed that the majority of the respondents perceived the instructional role as important or very important, less than 10% indicated that they practiced the role to a great or very great extent. Further study is needed to determine why more are not practicing the role and to determine ways to increase the practice of the instructional role mandated by the standards for school library media specialists.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		vi
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Overview	1
	Statement of the Problem	5
	Significance of the Study	6
	Assumptions and Delimitations	6
	Definition of Terms	7
2	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
	Background	9
	Models and Taxonomies for Instructional Design and Consultation	12
	Descriptive Literature	21
	Standards	29
	Research Studies	34
	Summary	40
3	METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	42
	Population	42
	Instrumentation	43
	Data Collection	45
	Data Analysis	45
4	RESULTS OF THE STUDY	47
	Questionnaires Returned	47
	Analysis of Data	48
5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	62
	Interpretation of Findings	62
	Implications	69
	Applications	72
	Conclusion	73
REFERENCES		74

Page

APPENDIXES 79

A Survey Questionnaire 79

B The Library Media Specialist's Taxonomy . . . 82

C Cover Letter 83

D The Loertscher Taxonomy 84

E Respondents' Comments from Questionnaire . . . 85

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Demographic Breakdown by Type of School	47
2	Frequency of Importance (n = 83)	49
3	Frequency of Practice (n = 83)	52
4	Frequency Percentages of Combined 5 and 4 Ratings for Importance (Very Important/Important) and Practice (Very Great/Great Extent) with Discrepancy Scores	54
5	Frequency of Interactive Label (n = 83) (Statements 8, 9, and 11 Rated 4 or 5)	57
6	Education Courses of 51 Interactive (Importance) Respondents	59

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

The role of the school library media specialist has progressed from the librarian who was the keeper of the books to the role of master teacher, instructional design consultant, or teacher-librarian, which is the term used in Canada (Haycock, 1985; Henri, 1987). In 1988, the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) published Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs. Recognized as the definitive work in the field to date, it defines the role of the school library media specialist as information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant. This role has evolved over several decades, as described in the literature dating back as far as the 1930s (Craver, 1986). Previous standards published by the American Association of School Librarians in 1960, 1969, and 1975 have contributed to the growth of the role. The 1975 standard, Media Programs: District and School, elevated the instructional role and described the requirements for that role as design and consultation. Design meant that the library media specialist was to

initiate and participate in curriculum development, while consultation meant that the library media specialist was to recommend media applications for instructional settings. By the late 1970s, most articles and books focused on the concept of instructional design and the librarian's role in it (Craver, 1986).

In the early 1980s, more books and articles appeared to define further the instructional role of the library media specialist. At least three models for instructional development or design and curriculum involvement by the library media specialist appeared in the literature (Cleaver & Taylor, 1983; Johnson, 1981; Loertscher, 1982; Turner, 1985).

Nickel (1984) listed 12 steps for the library media specialist to follow in order to play a key role in curriculum planning and development. These included being aware of the total instructional program of the school, visiting classes as often as possible, knowing the methods of teaching in use, becoming involved in the actual planning of the curriculum, conducting teacher inservice programs, knowing bibliographies in the textbooks and adding books cited in them to the media center collection, and participating as a member of the instructional team.

Baker (1984) went even further to describe the perception of the role of the library media specialist by teachers: "Teachers expect that the library media specialist will be capable of serving as a member of the teaching

team, willing and able to participate as a professional equal" (p. 32). He continued by stating:

> Administrators expect that library media specialists will be master teachers who display through technique, methodology, and discipline that they are excellent teachers of students with regular and special learning needs, and of their fellow teachers as well. The administrators expect the specialist to assume a leadership role, to influence the quality of instruction and the course of teaching and learning, not just in the library media center, but throughout the building. (p. 32)

Wehmeyer (1987) defined the instructional role of the library media specialist as consigliere, someone who is identified by and works closely with the principal and is an instructional leader within the school on the basis of expertise. "The consigliere is an indirect instructional leader who interacts as a colleague with classroom teachers. Such change facilitators do not issue directives; rather, they ask, inform, model, suggest and support" (Wehmeyer, 1987, p. 200).

As is evident from this brief overview, the instructional role of the library media specialist has evolved to one of prominence in the literature. However, research studies indicate discrepancies in theory and practice. Studies have shown that there appears to be a 10-year lag between the introduction of the conception and its actualization in the profession (Craver, 1986). "Instructional design, while introduced as an officially sanctioned activity by the 1975 standards, was far from a practiced reality as late as 1984" (Craver, 1986, p. 190). Stripling (1984)

pointed out that most of the research, theories, and models published to 1984 dealing with the role of instructional development were done by those in higher education, not by the practicing library media specialist. In a statewide Texas study, school library media specialists ranked competencies associated with consultation, instruction, and utilization (instructional development) very low in importance to effective job performance and level of skill development, as compared to the more traditional roles of organization, management, acquisition, and dissemination (Staples, 1981).

Eisenberg (1987) also stated that "the activities associated with curriculum support and instructional design have not been fully realized, exemplifying the gap between literature and practice" (p. 3). He concluded by saying: "the primary challenge is to narrow the gap between theory and practice and between internal and external perceptions and expectations" (p. 4).

More recently, two Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree research studies done at Georgia State University in Atlanta have shown discrepancies in theory and practice of this role. Winstead (1987) found that college educators and school system directors of educational media saw the most important present role of the library media specialist as working with teachers and supporting the curriculum by providing materials and equipment to help them teach. The media specialists in this study listed services to the students as the most important present role but indicated

their future role would probably be helping teachers more through curriculum planning. The second study concerning cooperation between teachers and the media specialists in public middle schools in Cobb County, Georgia, found interest in teacher/media specialist cooperation (team-teaching approach) to be high but actual involvement to be lacking (Williams, 1989).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine if a lag existed between the theoretical instructional role of design and consultation as described in the literature and the standards and the instructional role practiced by the school library media specialists in the DeKalb County Public Schools in DeKalb County, Georgia, during the 1989-90 school year. In order to determine this, the study sought answers to the following questions:

1. How important do the library media specialists perceive the instructional role of design and consultation to be?

2. To what extent are library media specialists practicing the instructional role of design and consultation?

3. What demographic variables relate to the library media specialists' perceived importance and practice of the instructional role?

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study can be described on two levels. First, the information gathered from this study could be useful at the system level to determine where DeKalb library media specialists are now and then to make informed decisions about where they should be in the near future and how to get there (Callison, 1984). It could help in assessing the success of and justification for the program of the DeKalb Department of Educational Media's direct emphasis on the role of "helping teachers teach," the term used by Turner (1985) and chosen by the department to encompass the instructional role of the library media specialist. The study could also offer feedback concerning the need for inservice training or staff development or help to define what is needed to reach the stated goal.

On a second level, Turner (1987) answered the question of what research needs to be done on instructional design (ID) consultation:

> Many studies have been carried out to determine the amount of ID consultation being performed and the factors that lead to this performance. Unfortunately, so few school library media specialists were doing high level consultation that less-than-useful results often emerge from these studies. It would be beneficial to replicate the methodology of the best of these, using a levels approach to helping teachers teach. (p. 230)

Assumptions and Delimitations

For this study, it was assumed that the DeKalb County library media specialists are familiar with Turner's (1985)

levels and Loertscher's (1988) taxonomy of the instructional role of the school library media specialist and are practicing the role at some level.

The study was limited to the library media specialists of the DeKalb County Public Schools in DeKalb County, Georgia.

Definition of Terms

The definitions which follow show how certain terms are used in this study.

Curriculum development or curriculum planning: the process educators use to determine what will be taught (Walker, 1988).

Instructional development or design (ID): the process that drives the planning, implementation, and evaluation of instruction in the classroom (Walker, 1988).

Instructional design consultant: direct involvement by the library media specialist in the curriculum at all stages, from needs assessment to evaluation (Stripling, 1984).

Master teacher: a consigliere (Wehmeyer, 1987), an indirect leader who interacts as a colleague with other teachers to bring about change by asking, informing, modeling, suggesting, and supporting; one who consistently performs the ID role at its highest level.

Resource-based instruction or teaching (RBT): an instructional technique where the teacher and the library

media specialist work together to plan, teach, and evaluate instructional units which more fully employ the media resources and skills available (Waddle, 1988); the opposite of textbook-based instruction.

Role: a part or function assumed by anyone.

Teacher-librarian: the Canadian term for the school library media specialist. It implies the instructional role (Haycock, 1985).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Background

The literature relating to the role of the school library media specialist as instructional design consultant is extensive. Craver (1986) examined the relevant literature pertaining to the changing instructional role of the school library media specialist from 1950 to 1984. She also analyzed the standards published by the American Association of School Librarians in 1960, 1969, and 1975 for the official sanction of the changes as well as research documenting the instructional status during this period to verify the changes. She found there had indeed been a substantial change in the role from study hall monitor to curriculum designer as reflected in the descriptive literature and in the standards. However, her research analysis indicated a possible time lag between the practiced instructional role of the library media specialist and the one espoused in the literature. The literature did not reflect the times as much as advance them. Standards, reports, and guidelines seemed to reinforce the literature, while research studies revealed that the instructional role had changed but not to the degree indicated in the literature.

Due to the extensive nature of the Craver study (1986) and the literature published prior to 1985 cited in chapter 1 of this study, the researcher decided to explore the literature from 1985 to the present to determine the current status of the instructional rolé of the library media specialist. The themes of this body of literature fell into four categories based on the intent of the material. These were (a) models and taxonomies for implementing instructional design, (b) descriptions of individual practitioners' programs and case studies, (c) essays addressing the standards, and (d) published and unpublished research studies.

Much of the literature addressing the instructional role of the library media specialist began with an overview of related literature. This was of course true of all the research studies and many of the descriptive essays. Roggenbuck (1985) discussed the choices and challenges for the school library media specialist's involvement in the curriculum established by the 1975 standards Media Programs: District and School. She discussed books and journal articles which went hand in hand with the standards to define the instructional role. She also made recommendations generated by the literature for implementation. She stressed that the media specialist's new role is curriculum consultant, curriculum catalyst, and change agent. It is the media specialist's responsibility to promote this role to teachers and administrators. The best way to accomplish

this is by initiating a demonstration project with a cooperating teacher on a particular unit of instruction with full utilization of media (a resource-based unit).

Eisenberg (1987) looked at the literature in his composite of the major themes and trends concerning the changing role of the library media specialist. He stated that the teaching role is the most dramatic and far-reaching extension of a traditional function. Direct instructional responsibilities require more training and background in teaching, methodology, and curriculum. Beyond just providing materials, a passive role, the library media specialist must be aware of curriculum, teaching methods, design considerations, and evaluation. As a media professional, the library media specialist must be involved with teaching-learning strategies, instructional media, and the most appropriate form of media to attain stated objectives, thus becoming an active participant in the learning process. "To date, the activities associated with curriculum support and design have not been fully realized, exemplifying a gap between literature and practice" (Eisenberg, 1987, p. 3). "The challenge is to narrow the gaps between theory and practice, and between internal and external perceptions and expectations" (p. 4).

Turner (1987) reviewed the literature for research that would give a picture of the school library media specialist who assists teachers. He found: "This person values the roles and possesses the competencies and the personality to

carry it out. This person is supported by the school administration, and this support includes clerical, budgetary, and scheduling resources" (p. 230). He concluded that given these factors, it is not surprising that the role has not been implemented in its highest form.

Models and Taxonomies for Instructional Design and Consultation

At least six models involving the school library media specialist in instructional design and curriculum development have appeared in the literature since 1981. All but two were developed by college library science educators. The models of the practicing media specialists (Bhalla, 1987; Kimmelbein, 1989) did not appear until much later. A seventh model was found in the literature of the teacher-librarians, which is the term used in Canada for the school library media specialist. This model was proposed in 1985 by the Alberta Board of Education and appeared in a publication entitled Focus on Education (Henri, 1987). This Canadian model will also be discussed as it relates to the instructional role of the teacher-librarian.

Johnson (1981) proposed a school instructional development model (SID), which focused on the library media specialist's role in instructional design. He stated that there is a need to identify a new facilitator of change within a system, since the traditional role of principal has

gone from "principal-teacher" to "administrator," and opportunities for them to facilitate change in the instructional system are more difficult to obtain. In this model the specific change is curriculum improvement, and the library media specialist is proposed as the appropriate agent of change. According to Johnson (1981):

> As mid-level managers within the school system, library media specialists can provide guidance and direction to curriculum improvement activities. . . . Also, among the school's staff, library media specialists appear most likely to have been trained in the skills required of the developer's role. (p. 271)

The SID model has three stages: (a) Define--generate rough outline, goals, and objectives; (b) Design--develop intended outcomes, performance objectives, and instructional activities; and (c) Evaluate--assess project strengths, weaknesses, and impact. Perhaps the most important outcome a library media specialist can expect from any development project is that the teacher involved will be more willing and better able to work with other professionals on instructional design projects in the future (Johnson, 1981).

A second model involving the school library media specialist in curriculum development is the TIE, an acroynm for Talking, Involving, and Evaluating (Cleaver & Taylor, 1983). Again, the model has three stages of cooperation which teachers and media specialists are to go through as they plan instruction together. It gives the media specialist a structure for the process of initiating cooperative planning with the teachers. It attempts "to bridge the gap

between theory and practice, forcing the media specialist to examine, step by step, the processes of his or her interactions" (Cleaver & Taylor, 1983, p. 2).

In the discussion of the TIE model and its implementation, two terms, proactive and reactive, appear which surface again in later literature (Callison, 1987). When following this model for instructional/curriculum development, the library media specialist would be exhibiting a proactive response, defined as actions beyond the media center which get the media specialist involved in the instructional program. Classroom visits, attending curriculum meetings, setting up interviews or planning sessions with teachers, and talking with them in the lounge are all described as proactive methods of learning about the curriculum. The traditional activities, those confined to the media center, were examples of reactive responses to the curriculum. The library media specialist simply helps to carry out the instructional decisions made by others. These include studying curriculum guides and textbooks, scheduling class visits, helping students, keeping records, and noticing the kinds of materials borrowed (Cleaver & Taylor, 1983).

Two observations can be made after studying both the SID and TIE models:

1. The media specialist is only involved with the planning of the units. There is no mention of the teaching role of the library media specialist.

2. In the evaluation stage, the assessment is concerned with the effectiveness of the materials and the overall project in relationship to the stated goals and objectives. Testing and students' grades would certainly be considered, but it is not clear as to the media specialist's involvement, if any, in this part of the process.

Loertscher (1982) recognized the demands on a school library media specialist's time and the guilty feelings that might arise when a deep involvement in instructional development with every teacher is not possible. Thus, he devised his taxonomy recognizing 11 acceptable and possible levels. Adopting the Canadian term resource-based teaching, the opposite concept of textbook-based teaching, the library media center is put into the very heart of the instructional program at the highest levels of the taxonomy. The library media specialist works systematically with the teacher to create units using the full resources of the library media center. This "new" role is a natural extension of the library media specialist and the library media center. The person who best knows materials in the various formats and who understands their use for making an impact on instruction is the logical partner for the teacher (Loertscher, 1988).

Loertscher's 11 levels can be combined into three approaches to instruction (Callison, 1987). Level 1, no involvement, to Level 5, cursory or informal planning, are part of the first category of reactive procedures. Here the

media specialist waits to be acted upon. The teacher determines the instructional needs, and the media specialist just supplies what is requested. Proactive procedures for the library media specialist include Levels 6-8. These are planned advanced gathering of materials, promotion of the multimedia instructional approach, and scheduled planning in the support role. The third category, the interactive levels, reaches the ideal of instructional design (Level 9), evaluation (Level 10), and curriculum development (Level 11). This stage may take several years to reach, even with the support of the principal and teachers. The media specialist acts not only as a leader but begins to examine the educational system in terms of evaluating its successes and failures. The curriculum development level involves integrating information skills into all areas of the curriculum as well as revising lessons and activities so that resources from the media center are utilized through unique and innovative approaches (Callison, 1987).

Another levels approach to helping teachers teach was presented by Turner (1985). He also recognized the difficulties of the library media specialist in trying to fit instructional development activities into an already full schedule. He suggested that all levels of involvement (including informal advice) between the teacher and the library media specialist are part of instructional development.

Turner (1985) presented a model of basic instructional design followed (sometimes intuitively) by "good" teachers. The steps in the model include knowing their students (needs assessment and learner analysis), knowing what they expect from their students (performance objectives), constructing reliable and valid tests (test design), selecting a variety of instructional materials and activities (material selection and activity development), using effective learning management techniques (implementation), and revising their approach based upon results (evaluation). Instructional design consultation involves the intervention of the library media specialist at some point in the steps of this instructional model.

As the teacher goes through the instructional design process, Turner (1985) recognized four levels of intervention or involvement by the library media specialist. These are: (a) no involvement, (b) passive participation, (c) reaction, and (d) action/education. The first level is self-explanatory. The second involves selection and maintaining of materials, equipment, and facilities which assist the teacher in implementing a step. The third level involves reaction to a teacher's informal request for information or materials. The fourth level most closely resembles instructional design consultation. The library media specialist actually works as part of the instructional team in implementing a number of the steps of the teaching process. "Often the purpose of involvement at this level is

to increase the teacher's ability to perform one or more of the steps subsequent to the intervention" (Turner, 1985, p. 15). This can be done by an inservice presented by the library media specialist on one or more steps, such as writing performance objectives or designing instruction to fit different learning styles.

In both Loertscher's taxonomy and Turner's levels, the library media specialist not only plans with the teacher but plays an active teaching role as instructor in the classroom and in the media center in the instruction of appropriate library or information skills and subject content if needed and desired by the teacher. The evaluation of the unit as well as the students' performance on tests can be the joint responsibility of the media specialist and the teacher. This is decided in the initial planning stage of the unit.

"Library media specialists need to separate their roles as warehouse managers from those of instructional innovators" (Bhalla, 1987, p. 26). Thus, the DIE model was developed for use in the elementary school for integrated library media-classroom projects. Design, Implement, and Evaluate make up the three stages of the DIE model. In the design stage, the project is planned cooperatively by the teacher and the library media specialist. In the implementation, the library media specialist teaches information access skills and information processing skills. Production skills are taught by the media specialist if they are required in the unit. The teacher is responsible for the subject

content. Both are responsible for evaluation of the unit and the students' learning. Bhalla (1987) commented: "The evaluation of papers adds extra responsibility for the media specialist, but the role is important for an integrated library media-classroom instructional project" (p. 27).

Kimmelbein (1989) provided the library media specialist with an overall model and systematic approach for designing, developing, and evaluating an integrated school library media program. Her model consists of three parts, each containing submodels. In the precollaborative stage, the library media specialist learns self-understanding and self-management. The second stage is the collaborative stage, in which several models are presented showing how to integrate the library media program into the entire school curriculum by first working with one teacher to plan, implement, and evaluate an instructional unit. Managerial techniques and strategies make up the third and final stage of the overall model. These techniques and strategies include time management, listening, conducting effective meetings, maintaining effective communications, climate building, and facilitating and managing change. Each of the stages is presented as separate components of the overall model. "However, they do not exist in isolation" (Kimmelbein, 1989, p. xxiv). The collaborative stage in its simplest form is quite similar to the other models discussed above. Again, the library media specialist is involved from the initial planning stage, through implementation, to the evaluation of the students'

learning and the assessment of the unit. The first and last stages of the overall model offer the practicing media specialist a new and useful, although somewhat involved, approach to the role of instructional design consultant.

In 1985, Alberta (Canada) Education outlined a recommended model for developing an effective integrated school library media program (Henri, 1987). The model consists, again, of three parts: instruction, development, and management, with instruction and student outcomes being the primary focus. The model shows instruction as a circle centered over the circles of management and development. The circles are connected by a triangle of cooperative planning and implementation. The model illustrates that excellence in instruction is impossible without the groundwork of developmental planning between the teacher and the teacher-librarian and the day-to-day fulfillment of management tasks. The point is that cooperative planning is not yet another role for the teacher-librarian but what has been shown in Canada to be the most effective way of integrating the administrators, teachers, teacher-librarians, and students in a resource-based approach to education to achieve optimal student learning.

By 1989, the term resource-based instruction appeared to be established in the literature. Toor and Weisburg (1989) further defined the term, explaining its timely worth as a teaching strategy and describing ways to convince and gain support from administrators and the confidence and

cooperation of classroom teachers. Their model provides a six-step framework for teacher/library media specialist planning sessions. Also provided are six practical concepts in the form of a teaching model to consider when actually designing a unit. These include selling the lesson, making it easy, adding the challenge, identifying the roadblocks, finding the shortcuts, and keeping on track. "The aim is to teach students research strategies that will work in any situation rather than just how to use a specific tool" (Toor & Weisburg, 1989, p. 5). To illustrate their model, 22 resource-based instructional units (8 for elementary, 6 for middle/junior high, and 8 for high school) are presented to be used by library media specialists as a hands-on seminar approach to implementing resource-based instruction.

Descriptive Literature

The topic of instructional design as a role for the school library media specialist has generated a large body of literature since 1984. Included are both journal articles and books theorizing on, making recommendations for, and/or describing practitioners' library media programs which include cooperative planning and instructional design. It is interesting to note, however, that the vast majority of this literature was not written by practicing library media specialists but by college educators and school system supervisors, managers, or coordinators.

There are sound reasons for making the library media center an integral part of the instructional program of a school. These reasons include the following:

1. The library media specialist has a working knowledge of the entire school curriculum. Historically, many enter the field after some years of classroom teaching.

2. Librarians hold a different viewpoint than that of administrators and teachers. They are "risk-takers" in accepting and learning new technology.

3. School librarians have had special training in applying selection criteria to items students choose to use. They guide students in the use, interpretation, and integration of these items into their course of study. As generalist/teacher, the librarian or library media specialist can aid in greater student academic achievements (Pretlow, 1987).

Haycock (1985) gave a slightly different view of the importance of the school librarian. He used the term teacher-librarian purposely, "for the signs are clear that there is relatively little danger to the continued existence of school libraries. The issue is the continued existence of the school librarian" (p. 102). School librarians have not been successful in developing an awareness and understanding of their role of professional teacher, as an equal partner in the educational enterprise, and in developing strong support for that position. His prescription for survival and even growth included a stated aim for the

program, a clearly defined role of the teacher-librarian and a commitment to that role, cooperative planning and teaching as a philosophical framework, and resource-based units of study which are jointly planned and taught and recorded for future use and improvement.

Methods for improving communications with teachers were stressed in the literature as a vehicle to bring about changes in awareness and understanding of the instructional role of the library media specialist. Hortin (1985) recommended a survey of the school community to help evaluate media services. Such an evaluation can give the media specialist the needed credibility to make changes in the program. It can also serve as a "means of educating the school community about instructional development, local production of curricular materials, and new instructional technology" (Hortin, 1985, p. 21).

Woolls (1988) suggested a "shopping list" as a subtle communication device. The list would contain services presently offered and services proposed which the teachers might like to have. The responses by the teachers would provide information on the awareness of the teachers of services, as well. This information could then be used in the planning of inservice programs presented either by the library media specialist or by an outside consultant.

Workshops and inservices were also suggested as a means to improved communication in much of the literature. These would not only improve library media specialist/teacher

communications but would, in turn, improve the selection process and services of the media center. Interaction at Turner's action/education level would serve to educate the faculty and increase their design skills. Not only does this interaction include membership of an instructional design team but also participation in inservice workshops (Griffin & Lamb, 1987).

Turner (1988b) defined inservice as any activity that enables a person to do a better job. Inservices are needed because knowledge is expanding at an ever-increasing rate. Library media specialists are providers as well as consumers of inservice education. In discussing what works in planning and conducting inservices, he stated that research has shown the inservices with the best chance of success are those developed with an instructional design approach, following the six steps in the instructional design process.

Providing inservices places the library media specialist in a leadership role in the effort to improve instruction within the school. In order to foster this leadership role, a model for staff development and peer support was established in New York in the Nassau School Library System (Tewel & Kroll, 1988). In the fall of 1986, a program of area clusters and full-day staff development programs was implemented to change the self-image of the library media specialists and to provide them with ongoing support. The program stressed the development of communication skills, techniques for working effectively with administrators,

involvement in subject-area department meetings and school-wide curriculum decisions, and proactive rather than reactive behavior. Through this program, the library media specialists "feel that they have begun to take charge of their professional lives and to gain more importance in the educational life of the school" (Tewel & Kroll, 1988, p. 248).

Most of the Summer, 1987, issue of School Library Media Quarterly was devoted to the leadership role of the library media specialist. The term "indirect leader" was defined by Wehmeyer as one who is a leader in the school, "not by virtue of position (supervisorial authority) but on the basis of expertise" (p. 200). This indirect leader is a change facilitator who interacts as a colleague with other faculty members by asking, informing, modeling, suggesting, and supporting. The library media specialist asks questions which open doors to cooperation. The library media specialist informs in various ways. The library media specialist models cooperative curriculum development, suggests any ideas likely to expand the teacher's involvement with the library media program, and supports the staff with materials and services and with understanding as they struggle with new ideas and perfect new skills.

"School library media specialists in the late 1980s may have perception problems, and these may not be theirs, but others" (Woolls, 1988, p. 130). As leaders in the school, the media specialists must exert leadership qualities, prove

their expertise in the fields of media and instruction, and promote themselves and their programs. This involves communication and interpersonal skills. A remedy to the perception problem has to do with power. The assumption is that knowledge is power and that the library media specialist has knowledge and therefore power. The literature is full of suggestions, as noted to this point, for assuming a power role and overcoming present problems. Woolls (1988) made many suggestions. The ones concerning the instructional role are based on Loertscher's taxonomy and the support of the curriculum through resource-based units cooperatively planned, implemented, and evaluated. Success with just one teacher can communicate the needed credibility of the library media specialist and the library media program, a power move. As Woolls (1988) stated:

> To have someone help make teaching both easier and more effective and assist with assessment of student progress should be irresistable. Attempts at instructional design must be done on a one-on-one basis with carefully selected teachers at the beginning so that the attempt is successful. (p. 89)

By 1987, literature began to appear describing successful instructional programs. Turner (1988a) offered a casebook of 13 school library media specialists across the country helping teachers teach in elementary, middle, junior high, and senior high schools by putting into practice instructional design at the action/education level. Each case was thoroughly discussed by the library media specialist involved in the unit. The types of cases ranged from

the actual planning, implementation, and evaluation of an instructional unit (in most cases) to involving faculty in books and audio-visual materials selection. Editorial comments following the steps of the instructional design process (needs assessment, performance objectives, learner analysis, test design, selection of materials and activities, implementation, and evaluation) were included by Turner for each case.

Waddle (1988) presented a personal reaction to resource-based teaching as "a fancy name for something I've been doing all along" (p. 78). However, further reading revealed to her the difference. The concept originated in Canada with Partners in Action: The Library Resource Center in the School Curriculum (Ontario Department of Education, 1981). The American version was described in Loertscher's Taxonomy of the School Library Media Program (1982), which was discussed earlier. The terms reactive and proactive explain the difference. What the library media specialist has been doing all along is reacting to someone else's unit plans. In Levels 9 and 10 of the taxonomy, the library media specialist is in on the initial planning of the unit as an equal partner, a proactive participant in instructional design.

As reported by Waddle (1988), an Iowa school system developed a year-long project to inform and explain resource-based teaching and its potential value to the instructional program of the district. The project included

a needs assessment in each library to determine what resource-based activities were already in place and the level of those activities according to Loertscher's taxonomy. Presentations were made at faculty meetings, and each librarian worked on one resource-based unit with a teacher. After implementation, the responses were "overwhelmingly positive and enthusiastic. . . . Everyone involved realized this one-year project was just the beginning of a long-term commitment to a sound educational concept" (p. 79).

Canadian teacher-librarians are also learning to set priorities and find the time for resource-based teaching. "The most common problem for teacher-librarians wanting to engage in CPP [cooperative program planning] is the lack of time" (Casey, 1987, p. 21). Casey (1987) examined her role as a teacher-librarian as a whole to determine just what she did. She went through a goal setting for CPP and objective process first. Then she discussed these with the school staff. To find the time for CPP, she completed a 5-week study on herself as teacher-librarian. After reading a great deal in the literature, she divided her functions into six categories: administrative/managerial, reference, clerical, teaching, professional, and cooperative program planning. She used these categories to analyze her time. After charting these functions over a 5-week period, she was more aware of how she spent her time and of which functions were basic to her role. These had to be in place before the

others could occur. It was obvious to Casey (1987) that the administrative/managerial function is fundamental: "It must be in place and operating smoothly before CPP can occur, otherwise there just isn't time" (p. 24). She also found ways of restructuring and prioritizing her time to give her more time for integrated unit planning. The time management skills she learned through her study gave her more direction. She learned that theory must become the goal: "It is a goal that can be reached with small solid steps" (p. 24). The theory that is espoused in the literature can become a reality.

Standards

In 1988, the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) published Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs. These guidelines addressed the issues and problems described in the literature discussed in the study to this point. The roles of the library media specialist were defined and explained clearly, especially that of instructional design consultant, which first appeared in the 1975 standards. Information Power also provoked the publication of many articles describing, explaining, and extolling the implications of the new and expanded guidelines for the profession.

In 1985, Liesener stated that several barriers needed to be overcome before the school library media programs

could contribute fully to the fostering of life-long learning and the development of the information seeking and utilization skills critical for succeeding in this complex and rapidly changing world. These barriers included: attitudes toward the library media program and the library media specialist; economic and personnel issues such as the status, treatment, and financial remuneration of the library media specialist; and planning and evaluating programs. Progress in planning and evaluating school library media programs had been extremely slow. The frame of mind in the field had been centered around "the traditional standards approach to measuring one's goodness by comparing what one 'has' rather than what one 'does' to what is recommended in some arbitrarily derived set of standards" (Liesener, 1985, p. 18).

Information Power (AASL & AECT, 1988) addresses this problem. It is very different from its precursors, for it is very much a programs document rather than a "numbers" document. Earlier standards stressed numbers over program descriptions. Quantitative recommendations for resources are not established in Information Power. Instead, the emphasis is on building a library media program that allocates existing resources according to the personal and instructional information needs of the students and staff and adds resources according to a development plan based on the curriculum and formulated with the aid of the library media specialist (Whitney, 1988).

Information Power also addresses the planning process. Chapter 1 ends with the statement: "Effective planning is the key to survival in an environment of accelerating change" (p. 13). Patrick (1989) focused on the planning process described in chapter 4. Planning should be applied to all operations within a school and within the library media center: programs, personnel, materials, equipment, facilities, and finances. Cooperative planning as it relates to curriculum-integrated library media programs on the higher level or resource-based teaching units on the lower level combines with the other areas of planning to produce the ultimate goal of improvement of teaching and learning.

Information Power delineates the roles of the school library media specialist as information specialist, teacher, and instructional design consultant. These roles have overlapping functions. However, the three interdependent roles are of equal importance. Information specialist is the:

> umbrella role that enables the school library media specialist to implement the other two roles effectively. School library media specialists are the information experts in contrast to those who are subject matter experts. School library media specialists understand how knowledge is most effectively communicated by teachers and most effectively received by students. (Walker, 1988, p. 21)

Chapter 3 of Information Power contains a brief coverage of the teaching role of the school library media specialist. However, it identifies two aspects of the role:

(a) instructing students, and (b) instructing teachers and other educators and parents. As Walker (1988) noted:

> If school library media specialists cannot teach their content--information skills--to students effectively, they should not expect to be accepted by colleagues as consultants in the teaching and learning process and curriculum development. This role allows school library media specialists to model behaviors in teaching information skills they want their colleagues to emulate in teaching science, social studies, and other content. (p. 22)

This defines the teaching role of the library media specialist as a "master teacher."

The third role, instructional design consultant, consists of advising other teachers on designing curriculum and developing instructional strategies. Information Power identifies four understandings school library media specialists must have to assume this role effectively: (a) an understanding of media, (b) an understanding of the application of media to the learning process, (c) an understanding of the needs of the students for information resources, and (d) an understanding of instructional strategies. When working effectively in the instructional design mode, the library media specialist assists teachers in planning, implementing, and evaluating instruction.

> The greater the involvement of the library media specialist in the instructional development, the more effectively they contribute to the success of teaching and learning. Therefore, the library media specialist must aggressively pursue opportunities to function at this level. (Walker, 1988, p. 23)

Stripling (1989) commented: "For each of the five challenges to the profession listed in Information Power, questions for individual media specialists' consideration, action, study and measurement can be generated" (p. 137). Practicing library media specialists must form partnerships with researchers by providing research sites and incorporating the results into their program. By assessing and reporting the results in terms of improved student learning, the profession can be advanced (Stripling, 1989).

The following are some questions generated by Information Power which are pertinent to the role of instructional consultant:

1. Which types of technology are most appropriate to different levels of students? What formats benefit each level the most in terms of learning?

2. How might teachers be encouraged to incorporate computers into their instruction?

3. What has been successful in helping teachers learn to use A-V materials more effectively as instructional tools?

4. What effect does the new technology have on the media specialist's instructional role?

5. How does new technology improve teaching and learning in specific classes?

6. What effect does student access to resources outside the school have on their motivation and quality of learning?

7. Are students more successful at research if they are taught processes for finding information instead of specific skills? What processes lead to the most improvement in finding and using information?

Library media specialists must choose only one or two questions to pursue at a time, based on the needs of the students and teachers. Once the areas are chosen, support from fellow teachers and administrators is essential. If the media program is integrated with the curriculum, a change in the library media center practices will be felt throughout the school. By building the partnerships suggested in Information Power and by defining the benefits to the students and the school program, media specialists will be able to build the necessary support for a program change mandated by a national cry for educational renewal and addressed in Information Power (Stripling, 1989).

Research Studies

As stated above, research and the reporting of that research is important in advancing the profession. Since 1984, several published and unpublished studies have been done concerning the instructional design consultant role of the library media specialist.

In 1986, a study was first reported from the Pulaski County Special School District in Arkansas that showed the effect of certain reporting techniques on instructional involvement of the library media specialist (Patrick, 1988).

The technique was essentially a tally sheet or checklist on which was recorded the occurrence of a particular action or service under two large categories: library media specialist response to teachers' requests; and library media specialist/teacher communication, planning, and cooperation. These were used to measure the services assumed to have a direct impact on instruction. The findings showed that when library media specialists are expected to behave in a certain way and know that their services are being measured, their behavior changes. In this study, the amount of cooperative planning doubled in a single year.

Loertscher, Ho, and Bowie (1987) examined the status of library media services in 209 public schools that appeared on the final list of "Exemplary Elementary Schools" for 1986 published by the U.S. Department of Education. The analysis of the data concerning instructional development was encouraging to the researchers:

> Although most studies have shown little interest on the part of library media specialists in engaging in instructional development, and many have been quite negative about the role, these data suggest that, while much progress is still needed, inroads are being made toward changing the role of the library media specialist in the schools. (Loertscher et al., 1987, p. 149)

Forty-seven percent of the respondents in this study indicated that they regularly consulted with teachers with teachers in advance of unit presentation, and 10% conducted exit evaluations with the teachers. The researchers recommended that library educators in schools of library science

and education concentrate on teaching practical methods of instructional involvement until these skills become second nature to prospective school library media specialists.

Naylor and Jenkins (1988) studied principals' understanding of the terms describing the functions of the library media specialists as stated in the 1983 North Carolina evaluation instrument. Results showed that principals have the highest understanding of the library media specialist's role in creating the public image of the library media center. The lowest understanding is in services provided, procedures for reviewing and selecting materials, and evaluating the quality of the collection, the "hows" of the library. The competencies about which principals were the most knowlegeable were those of setting long-range goals and integrating library media skills into the curriculum. These are most like those required of teachers as well as administrators. "The results of this study present a bleak picture of principals' understanding and involvement in the library media specialists' contribution to instruction" (Naylor & Jenkins, 1988, p. 239). The researchers recommended that the library media specialists view the evaluation conference as a means to inform and interpret their roles for the principals, since "the major source of information about library media programs and library media specialists appear to be the library media specialists themselves" (p. 239).

Taylor (1985) studied the role of the library media specialist as perceived by classroom teachers and media

specialists. She found that in the Douglas County School System in Georgia, both groups perceived the role of the library media specialist as one of providing more traditional services, with the media specialist not having an important role in curriculum planning and instructional technology. Crowell (1985) surveyed the administration, teachers, and students of a middle school also in Douglas County, Georgia, to determine their expectations and needs. The library media specialist's responsibilities were rated. Three responsibilities received about 90% ratings: (a) acquires and publicizes materials for professional collections, (b) helps teachers choose temporary room collections, and (c) allows users to evaluate and add to the collection. Plans with teachers to integrate media skills with content objectives received only a 70% rating. Both of these studies showed the expectation of the media programs only on the reaction level.

Williams (1989) studied the teacher/media specialist cooperation and services within middle schools in Cobb County, Georgia. She found that 83.3% of the media specialists responding had worked in a team-teaching situation in which ideas and responsibilities were shared to plan, develop, and implement student instruction. Only 11.1% of the teacher respondents had participated in such a unit. Descriptions of the units revealed that most were reactive in nature; the library media specialist reacted to the teacher's request. The conclusion drawn was that interest

in teacher/media specialist cooperation is high, but actual involvement is lacking. The need to implement suggested teaming situations was found, and additional research in this area was advised.

Winstead (1987) studied the perception of present and future roles of the library media specialist held by college educators, system directors, and practicing library media specialists in Henry County, Georgia. She found that college educators in the field and school system directors of educational media saw the most important present role of the library media specialist as working with teachers and supporting the curriculum by providing materials and equipment to help them teach. The media specialists listed services to the students as the most important present role but indicated their future role would probably be helping teachers more through curriculum planning.

Smith (1988) investigated effective and ineffective incidents of library media service functions as perceived by faculty members in an urban, multicampus school district. Results indicated that circulation service was perceived by faculty as the most effective function of the school library media program. The respondents (201) never referred to services involving the library media specialist's expertise in curriculum development, instructional design, and leadership. The recommendations were that inservices on the untapped, available services and the mission and goals of

the library media center should be provided to teachers and administrators.

From profiles of library media specialists of the 18 Washington State high schools with exemplary programs, Christensen (1986) formulated a model for the school library media specialist. Aspects of the model included: (a) exhibits a responsibility to promote skills of life-long learning, (b) does not fit the occupational stereotype, (c) is proactive and is a leader, (d) is actively involved in curriculum development, (e) is committed to quality service, and (f) is committed to the library profession.

Loertscher's taxonomy was used as the basis of a questionnaire sent to Michigan high school library media specialists and principals to determine the levels of expectation and involvement of the media specialists in curriculum development (Fitzgerald, 1985). Conclusions derived from this study included the following:

1. Principals' expectations for the involvement of the school library media specialists in curriculum development tend to exceed the actual involvement.

2. School library media specialists who function at the high involvement level have more formal education than those in the low involvement level.

3. Principals with high expectations responded that they receive more written reports from the library media specialists than those principals reporting with low expectations.

4. School library media specialists in the high involvement level work in larger schools than those in the low involvement group.

5. Budgets for media center materials are larger in schools where there are high expectations and involvement.

6. Where the ratio of library media specialists to teachers is higher, the involvement of school library media specialists in curriculum development is lowest.

Summary

Haycock (1989) summarized the research in "teacher-librarianship" after reviewing related dissertations from 1957 to 1988. Six points made in his summary were identical to the conclusions drawn by the researcher from this review of the literature concerning the instructional role of the library media specialist:

1. The development of student competencies in research and study skills is most effective when integrated with classroom instruction through cooperative program planning and team teaching by two equal teaching partners, the classroom teacher and the library media specialist. (This is the premise on which most of the literature was based.)

2. Library media specialists in secondary schools are not as involved in cooperative planning and team teaching with classroom colleagues as equal teaching partners to the extent that principals, teachers, and media specialists themselves believe that they should be.

3. More and more varied and continuing education opportunities need to be provided for library media specialists in order for them to pursue their own professional growth. (This is stated and implied in the literature, especially that concerned with the leadership role.)

4. The role of the principal is the key factor in the development of an effective school library program. (His/her understanding of the role and support is essential.)

5. Library media specialists need to assume more responsibility for writing about their role and their programs for professional journals read by teachers and administrators as well as for their own professional journals.

6. Library media specialists who are less cautious and more extraverted tend to be more successful. (The role defines them as instructional leaders in the school.)

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This was a descriptive study of the role of the library media specialist as instructional design consultant. The perception and implementation of the role, defined in Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs (AASL & AECT, 1988) and explained by Turner (1985) and Loertscher (1988) as a series of levels, were studied to determine to what extent or level the role is being practiced in the DeKalb County Schools' library media center programs. To gather information, a survey instrument (see Appendix A) was designed by the author and sent to all the library media specialists in the DeKalb County Schools, DeKalb County, Georgia.

Population

DeKalb is one of five counties which make up the metropolitan Atlanta area. It serves a total school population of over 73,000 students in 77 elementary and 24 secondary (5 junior high and 19 high) schools, making it the largest school system in Georgia. There is a total of 128 library media specialists, 79 elementary and 47 secondary plus 1 assigned to the Fernbank Science Center and 1 to the Special

Education Centers, who are in a position to practice the role of instructional design consultant. Thus, the population for this study consisted of 128 practicing library media specialists in the DeKalb County School System.

Instrumentation

A three-page questionnaire was developed by the author to provide answers to the research questions. It was arranged in three parts. The first part contained 18 taxonomy and taxonomy-related statements that the respondents rated on a Likert scale as to the statements' value to their job performance. The second part consisted of the same 18 statements; the respondents rated them on a second Likert scale as to the extent to which they practice the statements in their instructional role. The third part contained demographic questions and a section for optional open-ended comments.

The statements were formulated based on Loertscher's (1988) "The Library Media Specialist's Taxonomy" (see Appendix B) and a list of competencies for consultation, utilization, instruction, and learning resources development (Staples, 1981) found in the literature. The first eight statements address the levels of the taxonomy beginning with Level 2 (Self-Help Warehouse) and proceeding in order through Level 9 (Instructional Design, Level I). Statements 9 through 18 address Level 10 (Instructional Design, Level II) and Level 11 (Curriculum Development). The rating of

these statements as to their value in job performance was used to determine the perceived importance of the role of instructional design consultant by the respondents. The rating of the statements as to their extent of practice was used to determine the level and frequency of implementation of the role.

The 11 levels of the taxonomy have been grouped into three philosophical categories (Callison, 1987). Levels 1 through 5 are Reactive levels. Levels 6 through 8 are Proactive levels. The school library media specialist dramatically promotes media services and the instructional use of a variety of media. The third category, Interactive, encompasses Levels 9 through 11.

> The media specialist acts, not only as a leader, but also begins to examine the educational system in terms of evaluating its successes and failures. . . . The media specialist becomes an important force for curriculum development. This impact involves not only integrating information skills into all areas of the curriculum, but working to revise the lessons and activities to the degree that such lessons require the use of the resource center. (Callison, 1987, p. 25)

The responses were scored according to these three philosophical categories or subareas in order to label the respondent as Reactive, Proactive, or Interactive in perception and practice of the instructional role. These three subareas correspond to Turner's (1985) second, third, and fourth levels of passive participation, reaction, and action/education.

A class of 10 library media specialists evaluated the questionnaire. Changes were made at their recommendation in length, wording, and choice of questions which were considered to be more in line with the original problem statement.

Data Collection

A cover letter (see Appendix C) and the questionnaire were sent through the school system courier mail early in December, 1989, to the 128 library media specialists in the DeKalb County School System. They were asked to return the questionnaire before December 20, 1989, in a self-addressed, stamped envelope provided in the mailing. Due to the effort to provide strict anonymity for the respondents, the return envelopes were not coded in any way. Therefore, in early January a general follow-up request was sent, again through the courier, to all the library media specialists as a reminder to those who had not already responded.

Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X) computer programs on the mainframe at Georgia State University. Descriptive and inferential analyses were conducted on the data in the following ways:

1. Frequency of responses to each statement was reported.

2. Each respondent received a score for each subarea (Reactive, Proactive, and Interactive) based on his or her responses to the corresponding statements of the taxonomy for importance and practice.

3. By virtue of the scores on the subareas, the respondents were labeled Reactive, Proactive, and/or Interactive in practice of the instructional role.

4. These demographic variables were considered: years of experience as a classroom teacher and a library media specialist, highest degree held in library science, date of last formal college course in library science and any specific training in instructional design, present elementary or secondary media center position, size of faculty, professional organization memberships, membership on curriculum committees, and any awards or honors given the media specialist or the media center program. Using these variables, analysis was conducted to determine if a relationship existed between any of these variables and the library media specialists who were labeled Interactive.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Questionnaires Returned

Survey questionnaires were sent to the 128 school library media specialists in the DeKalb County School System. Responses were received from 85 or 66%. However, two media specialists (one elementary and one secondary) failed to respond to the second page, rendering their surveys unusable. Therefore, 83 or 65% of the DeKalb school library media specialists were represented in the results of the study. Table 1 shows the demographic breakdown by type of school of the respondents.

Table 1

Demographic Breakdown by Type of School

Type of School	Total Possible	Responded	%	% of Respondents
Elementary	79	49	62%	59%
Junior High	10	6	60%	7%
Senior High	37	27	73%	33%
Centers	2	1	50%	1%
Total	128	83		100%

For the purpose of this narrative, the respondents from the junior high schools, senior high schools, and the center were grouped together under the term secondary. This was the grouping applied within the DeKalb system. Therefore, 59% of the respondents were in elementary schools and 41% were in secondary schools.

Analysis of Data

In order to determine their perception of the importance of the instructional role to their position, the respondents were asked to rate the importance of the taxonomy and taxonomy-related statements on page 1 of the questionnaire to their role as a school library media specialist. Table 2 shows the frequency of the responses. The two statements considered by the most respondents as very important were Statement 1 ("Provide access to materials through organization and classification that integrate materials in all formats into a unified collection") and Statement 2 ("Provide reference services and materials to individual students and teachers"). The two considered very important by the least number of respondents were Statement 10 ("Participate as an equal partner with the teacher in assessing students' achievement (grading) in a resource-based unit") and Statement 15 ("Explain various styles of learning that account for individual differences among students"). These two statements and Statements 12-18, taken from the literature, specifically define the

Table 2

Frequency of Importance (n = 83)

Abbreviated Taxonomy and Taxonomy Related Statements	Ratings[a] 5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
1. Provide access	73	9	0	1	0	0	0
2. Reference services	78	5	0	0	0	0	0
3. Gather materials with no notice	11	31	32	6	3	0	0
4. Plan informally	47	32	2	2	0	0	0
5. Gather materials in advance	66	15	1	0	0	1	0
6. Promote philosophy	57	14	10	1	0	1	0
7. Plan formally a teacher-planned unit	54	24	4	1	0	0	0
8. Help teachers teach as supplemental	41	24	12	6	0	0	0
9. Help teachers teach in resource-based unit	56	19	8	0	0	0	0
10. Equal partner in resource-based unit	7	15	35	21	5	1	0
11. School curriculum committee member	39	25	15	1	1	0	2
12. Production of instructional materials	13	18	25	21	5	1	0
13. Analyze materials to curriculum	26	33	18	4	1	1	0
14. Conduct inservices	22	38	19	3	1	0	0
15. Know learning styles	4	16	33	21	9	0	0

(table continues)

Table 2--Continued

Abbreviated Taxonomy and Taxonomy Related Statements	Ratings[a] 5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
16. Use information, communication, and learning theories	14	21	33	9	5	1	0
17. Identify usage of communication media	23	35	17	6	1	1	0
18. Assist in design of instructional program	20	28	24	9	1	1	0

[a]Scale: 5 = Very Important, 4 = Important, 3 = Of Some Importance, 2 = Of Little Importance, 1 = Of No Importance, 0 = No Response, NA = Not Applicable.

various aspects of the instructional design and consultation role. The ratings for these were noticeably lower than the statements dealing with the traditional roles of warehousing materials and making them accessible. Production of materials, an emphasis in the 1970s and now considered part of the instructional design process, was rated "Of some importance" by 25 respondents.

To determine if the DeKalb school library media specialists were practicing the instructional role as defined in the literature, the respondents rated the same statements as to their frequency of practice. Table 3 shows the frequency of their responses to page 2 of the questionnaire. Again, the statements practiced to a very great extent by the greatest number of respondents were the first two. Statements 10 and 15 were practiced to a very great extent by only seven and four respondents, respectively. As in Table 2, there was an even more noticeable drop in the ratings of the statements which more specifically define the instructional design and consultation role (Statements 12-18).

Table 4 shows: (a) the percentage of the respondents who rated the importance of the statements as either very important (5) or important (4); (b) the percentage of the respondents who rated the practice of the statements as done to a very great extent (5) or to a great extent (4); and (c) the discrepancy between the two ratings. The percentage of respondents who rated these statements as practiced to a

Table 3

Frequency of Practice (n = 83)

Abbreviated Taxonomy and Taxonomy Related Statements	Ratings[a] 5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
1. Provide access	73	6	1	1	0	2	0
2. Reference services	65	14	3	0	0	1	0
3. Gather materials with no notice	17	25	31	9	1	0	0
4. Plan informally	30	36	16	1	0	0	0
5. Gather materials in advance	38	37	8	0	0	0	0
6. Promote philosophy	44	16	15	7	0	1	0
7. Plan formally a teacher-planned unit	21	20	28	12	2	0	0
8. Help teachers teach as supplemental	12	19	31	17	4	0	0
9. Help teachers teach in resource-based unit	18	22	19	16	8	0	0
10. Equal partner in resource-based unit	1	6	13	23	40	0	0
11. School curriculum committee member	6	6	6	4	58	0	3
12. Production of instructional materials	5	6	18	30	24	0	0
13. Analyze materials to curriculum	9	17	30	14	11	2	0
14. Conduct inservices	8	17	31	21	6	0	0
15. Know learning styles	4	1	10	34	34	0	0

(table continues)

Table 3-Continued

Abbreviated Taxonomy and Taxonomy Related Statements	Ratings[a] 5	4	3	2	1	0	NA
16. Use information, communication, and learning theories	6	10	22	27	18	0	0
17. Identify usage of communication media	10	28	26	14	4	1	0
18. Assist in design of instructional program	6	13	26	24	12	2	0

[a]Scale: 5 = To a Very Great Extent, 4 = To a Great Extent, 3 = To a Moderate Extent, 2 = To a Small Extent, 1 = None at All, 0 = No Response, NA = Not Applicable.

Table 4

Frequency Percentages of Combined 5 and 4 Ratings for Importance (Very Important/Important) and Practice (Very Great/Great Extent) with Discrepancy Scores

Abbreviated Taxonomy and Taxonomy Related Statements	Importance	Practice	Discrepancy Scores
1. Provide access	98.8%	95.2%	3.6%
2. Reference services	100.0%	95.2%	4.8%
3. Gather materials with no notice	50.6%	50.6%	0.0%
4. Plan informally	95.2%	79.5%	15.7%
5. Gather materials in advance	97.6%	90.4%	7.2%
6. Promote philosophy	85.6%	72.3%	13.3%
7. Plan formally a teacher-planned unit	94.0%	49.4%	44.6%
8. Help teachers teach as supplemental	78.3%	37.4%	40.9%
9. Help teachers teach in resource-based unit	90.4%	48.2%	42.2%
10. Equal partner in resource-based unit	26.5%	8.4%	18.2%
11. School curriculum committee member	77.1%	14.4%	62.7%
12. Production of instructional materials	37.4%	13.2%	24.2%
13. Analyze materials to curriculum	71.1%	31.3%	39.8%

(table continues)

Table 4-Continued

Abbreviated Taxonomy and Taxonomy Related Statements	Importance	Practice	Discrepancy Scores
14. Conduct inservices	72.3%	30.1%	42.2%
15. Know learning styles	24.1%	6.0%	18.1%
16. Use information, communication, and learning theories	42.2%	19.2%	23.0%
17. Identify usage of communication media	69.9%	45.7%	24.2%
18. Assist in design of instructional program	57.8%	22.9%	34.9%

great or very great extent was lower in every case than the rating of the statement's importance except for Statement 3 ("Gather materials with no advance notice"), which was rated as either 4 or 5 by 50.6% in both importance and practice.

The most notable discrepancies between importance and practice ratings in the taxonomy statements (Statements 1-9 and 11) were in Statements 7, 8, 9, and 11. The discrepancies were 44.6%, 40.9%, 42.2%, and 62.7%, respectively. Even though 77.1% rated Statement 11 ("Participate as a member of the school curriculum committee") as important or very important, only 14.4% practiced this statement to a great or very great extent, resulting in the largest discrepancy (62.7%) between importance and practice. This was the only statement with NA responses, due to the fact that 16 respondents commented that their school had no curriculum committee.

Callison (1987) divided the 11 levels of Loertscher's taxonomy into three philosophical categories or subareas of instructional involvement (see Appendix E): Reactive (Levels 1-5), Proactive (Levels 6-8), and Interactive (Levels 9-11). At the Reactive level, the library media specialist simply supplies what is requested. At the Proactive level, the library media specialist actively promotes the services of the media center and the instructional uses of the forms of media. At the Interactive level, the library media specialist acts not only as an instructional leader "but begins to examine the educational system in

terms of evaluating its successes and failures" (Callison, 1987, p. 25), thus becoming an important force for curriculum development.

Labels of Reactive, Proactive, and/or Interactive were given to the respondents who gave the corresponding taxonomy statements a rating of either 4 or 5 (Important/Very Important or To a Great/Very Great Extent). The Reactive label was applied to 94% and 73.5% of the respondents for importance and practice, respectively. The Proactive label described 81.9% of the respondents in importance ratings but only 41% in practice ratings. Table 5 shows the frequency of the Interactive label, defined as the instructional consultant level of the taxonomy, which was the focus of this study, and the breakdown by media center position (elementary or secondary) of the respondents.

Table 5

Frequency of Interactive Label (n = 83)

(Statements 8, 9, and 11 Rated 4 or 5)

Level of School of Respondents Rated Interactive	Importance		Practice	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Elementary	25	53.2	5	10.6
Secondary	26	76.5	3	9.1
Total	51	61.4	8	9.6

A frequency analysis of demographic data was then done to determine if any significant relationships existed between the 51 respondents who were labeled Interactive in their perception of the importance of the instructional role. The results were as follows:

1. A greater percentage of secondary media specialists (76.5%) than elementary (53.2%) received the Interactive label for perceived importance.

2. Five years or less classroom experience were reported by 78.4% (40).

3. Ten years or less experience as a library media specialist were reported by 19 (37.3%). Thirty-two (62.7%) reported 11 years or more.

4. Teaching faculties of less than 60 were reported by 62.5% (30).

5. This label was given to 10 with specialist degrees, 40 with master's degrees, and 1 with a bachelor's degree.

6. These library science degrees were received by 51% (26) after 1976.

7. The last library course was taken after 1976 by 84.3% (43).

8. The frequency of the education courses taken which would be helpful in the instructional role is given in Table 6.

9. Thirty-eight (74.5%) were members of the Georgia Library Media Association (GLMA), 11 (21.6%) the Georgia

Table 6

Education Courses of 51 Interactive (Importance) Respondents

Type of Course	Frequency
Curriculum	40
Learning Styles	22
Methods of Teaching	37
Test Design	10
Communication Skills	32
Production of Materials	44

Library Association (GLA), 12 (23.5%) the Georgia Association for Instructional Technology (GAIT), 11 (21.6%) the American Library Association (ALA), 7 (13.7%) the American Association of School Librarians (AASL), and 1 (2%) the Society of School Librarians International (SSLI). None listed membership in the Association for Educational Communication and Technology (AECT). Ten listed membership in at least one educational professional organization, and two listed membership in library organizations other than those just listed separately.

10. Fifteen (29.4%) had received at least one honor or award.

11. Twelve (23.5%) were members of their school's curriculum committee. Eight (15.7%) indicated that their school did not have a curriculum committee. Three had served on a county/system curriculum committee.

A frequency analysis of the demographic data of the eight respondents who were labeled Interactive in practice of the instructional role was also done to determine if any relationships existed between the eight Interactive library media specialists. The results were as follows:

1. Three had no classroom teaching experience, three had from 1 to 5 years, one had 10 years, and one had 18 years.

2. Four had from 11 to 15 years experience as a library media specialist, two had less than 10 with 1 and 6 years, and two had more than 15 with 19 and 21 years.

3. Two did not give the size of their faculty. Four were in schools with 30 to 60 teachers. One had less than 30 teachers, and one had more than 60.

4. Seven had master's degrees in library science. One had a specialist degree.

5. Four received their degrees after 1976 and three before 1976, while one did not report a date.

6. Five had taken formal college library science courses since 1985. One took a course in 1975 and one in 1978, while one did not report a date.

7. All eight had taken curriculum courses. Four had taken courses dealing with student learning styles. Seven

had taken methods of teaching, but only one had taken a course in test design. Three had taken a communication skills course, and seven had taken production of instructional materials.

8. Five were members of GLMA, one GLA, three GAIT, one ALA, and two AASL. None reported membership in AECT or SSLI. One listed membership in an educational professional organization as well as two library organizations, and one listed membership in three educational professional organizations and no library organizations.

9. Only one had received an award or honor while a media specialist. The honor was Teacher of the Year.

10. Seven were members of their school's curriculum committee, and one had served on a county/system curriculum committee.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine if a lag existed between the theoretical instructional role of library media specialists and the role actually practiced in the schools. A study of the literature from 1950 to 1984 (Craver, 1986) revealed that a lag of at least 10 years existed from the time of the 1975 standards, which elevated the instructional role and described its requirements as design and consultation, through 1984. A review of the literature from 1984 through 1989 revealed that a lag continued to exist. However, several articles suggested that the lag or gap had narrowed by 1989.

Interpretation of Findings

This was a descriptive study of the instructional role of the practicing library media specialists in the DeKalb County School System in DeKalb County, Georgia, where a concerted effort had been made beginning in August of 1988 by the Director of Educational Media to inform, encourage, and require the media specialists to make the instructional role a reality. To gather the needed data to measure the extent of the gap between theory and practice, a three-page

questionnaire was developed by the author to determine the perception and practice of the instructional role by the DeKalb library media specialists during the 1989-90 school year. The questions were based on Loertscher's (1988) taxonomy for school library media specialists (see Appendix B) and the levels approaches, defined in the literature, to the instructional role. Turner (1985) labeled four levels of intervention or instructional involvement of the school library media specialist as no involvement, passive participation, reaction, and action/education. The first level needs no explanation. The second level, passive participation, involves selecting and maintaining materials, equipment, and facilities which assist a teacher in implementing instruction. The third level involves reaction to a teacher's informal request for information and materials. Action/education most closely resembles instructional design consultation. The library media specialist actually works as an equal member of an instructional team.

Callison (1987) divided Loertscher's taxonomy into three philosophical categories of instructional involvement (see Appendix D). He labeled these levels Reactive, Proactive, and Interactive. These categories correspond to Turner's second, third, and fourth levels. At the Reactive level, the library media specialist simply supplies what the teacher determines is needed. At the Proactive level, the library media specialist actively promotes media services and the instructional use of the various forms of media

available. At the Interactive level, the library media specialist becomes involved in the instructional program beyond the media center and takes on a role of instructional leadership and innovation.

Using these three levels of instructional involvement, this study also attempted to assign labels (Reactive, Proactive, and/or Interactive) to the respondents based on their ratings of the taxonomy statements. Responses to the questionnaire were received from 85 of the 128 mailed. Two of the responses were unusable. Therefore, this study represented the responses of 83 or 65% of the DeKalb library media specialists.

Answers were sought to three questions. From the data received, it would appear that the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The DeKalb County library media specialists perceived their instructional role to be important. However, it would seem that they viewed this role as supportive due to the fact that only one-fourth of the respondents felt that it was important for them to be an equal partner with a classroom teacher in grading the students in a resource-based unit. The drop in ratings of importance of the responses to the statements which imply an instructional leadership and innovator role, such as "Explain various styles of learning that account for individual differences among students" and "Use information, communication, and learning theories and models in relation to learning

styles," also pointed to this conclusion. Several commented that these areas belong to the instructional lead teacher and the assistant principal for instruction (see Appendix E).

2. The DeKalb County library media specialists were not practicing the instructional role to a great extent. In fact, less than half reported that they were practicing to a great or very great extent on Levels 9 and 10 of Loertscher's taxonomy, which are defined as the actual instructional design levels, but only eight (9.6%) DeKalb library media specialists were given the Interactive label by this study according to their combined responses to Statements 8, 9, and 11, implying that "the media specialist begins to consider unique instructional approaches and accepts the role of instructional innovator" (Callison, 1987, p. 25). It is important to note, however, that only 5% of the 83 respondents reported they were not practicing Level 9 at all, and only 10% indicated no practice of Level 10.

3. There appeared to be no evidence that any of the demographic variables contributed to the perceived importance and practice of the instructional role of all the library media specialists who were labeled Interactive by this study. The only results that could possibly be considered significant occurred in the breakdown by school levels and years of library media experience. Only half of the elementary library media specialists could be labeled

Interactive for perceived importance, while more than three-fourths of the secondary respondents might be characterized by this label. Of the 9.6% who were designated Interactive in practice, three-fourths had more than 11 years of experience. Of the 51 labeled Interactive in perceived importance, 32 (62.7%) had at least 11 years of experience.

These results tend to indicate that there was a gap between the theoretical instructional role, introduced by the 1976 standards describing the instructional role as design and consultation, and that practiced by the DeKalb school library media specialists in 1989. However, the encouraging results produced by this study showed that 61.4% of the respondents indicated the instructional role was important to their position as a school library media specialist, even though the larger percentage of this group was at the secondary level.

Due to the fact that this study produced no common demographic variable among the Interactive respondents, an assumption could be made that the common factor was in the stressed importance of the instructional role by the Director of Educational Media for the DeKalb County Schools. At the end of the 1987-88 school year, the Director sent each media specialist copies of A School Library Media Specialist's Role: Helping Teachers Teach (Turner, 1985) and Taxonomies of the School Library Media Program (Loertscher, 1988). These were required summer reading for DeKalb County media specialists. In August, Turner spoke to the library

media specialists at the general meeting prior to the opening of school. His topic was "Helping Teachers Teach." This became the motto of the DeKalb library media specialists for the 1988-89 school year. Throughout that year, memos were sent by the Director encouraging the planning, implementation, and evaluation of one or more resource-based units with a classroom teacher. The library media specialists were encouraged to include implementation of these units into their personal goals for the year. In a memo dated September 14, 1989, concerning goal statements and a plan of action for each goal for the 1989-90 school year, they were instructed to progress to Levels 9 and 10 of Loertscher's taxonomy by requiring them to show evidence that at least one resource-based teaching unit was developed and implemented with a new or master teacher. Cluster groups, made up of the library media specialists from a high school and its feeder schools, were instructed to focus on resource-based units and share the results at their meetings. On several occasions, the Director also shared research studies with the library media specialists illustrating the need for outside resources in the instruction of the various disciplines including science, social studies, and so on, due to the limited instructional strategies employed by most teachers (Goodlad, 1983) and the poor quality or lack of information or focus of the textbooks in use.

This emphasis during the 1989-90 school year, the year of this study, on resource-based instructional units could account for the percentage differences in both importance and practice of Statements 8 and 9 (refer to Table 3). It would appear that media specialists helping teachers plan, implement, and evaluate instructional units where the entire content is based on resources and activities of the library media program, the definition of resource-based units, was more important and practiced by more library media specialists than units where media center materials are supplemental or used as enrichment.

The fact that the statistics show only eight library media specialists appeared to be practicing the instructional role to a great extent (labeled Interactive) cannot be fully explained, except to note that at the time of this study the DeKalb media specialists had only been required to plan, implement, and evaluate one resource-based unit. The study was conducted during the first half of the 1989-90 school year. Possibly the results would have been different had the media specialists had the entire school year to consider when answering the questionnaire.

One limitation of the study which may have affected the results was the statement concerning membership on the school curriculum committee, one of three statements whose ratings determined the Interactive label. Even though 77.1% of the respondents considered membership important, 69.8% (58) indicated that they did not serve on the curriculum

committee. Of these, it is not possible to know the exact number who are in schools with no curriculum committee. Three respondents rated this statement with an NA for practice. However, at least 13 other respondents actually stated on the third page of the questionnaire that their school did not have a curriculum committee. One stated that she was a member of her school's "leadership" committee but did not indicate its function. Another stated that the other media specialist in the school served on the committee, and two stated that the principal selected the committee and they would serve if asked. Even if these 20 respondents had been labeled Interactive in practice, the results of 33.7% (28 total with this label) would have been greater but not that impressive.

It is important to remember the limitations of the statistical significance of any study. "It is the product of an instructional program (student activities, lesson plans, skills learned and demonstrated) which prove to be the convincing measurements of the media program's instructional role" (Callison, 1987, p. 25). This study did not consider the product.

Implications

Craver (1986) found research studies from 1950 to 1984 revealed that the instructional role of the school library media specialist had changed but not to the degree indicated in the literature. A time lag of at least 10 years was

indicated between the instructional role espoused in the literature and that being practiced in the schools. The results of this study appear to support the findings of previous studies and perhaps extend this time lag to more than 10 years.

The responses to the statements drawn from the literature as aspects of the instructional role, specifically Statements 10 and 12-18, in both importance and practice also indicate that many of the DeKalb library media specialists may not be in agreement with the instructional leadership and innovator aspects of the role. "Library media specialists need to separate their roles as warehouse managers from those of instructional innovator" (Bhalla, 1987, p. 26). A case can be made for library media specialists being curriculum coordinators. They work with all the teachers in the school, designing instruction and making effective use of the media center materials. However, they possess neither the line authority nor the accepted academic credentials of the curriculum coordinator (Naylor & Jenkins, 1988).

"The evaluation of papers adds extra responsibility for the media specialist, but the role is important for an integrated library media-classroom instructional project" (Bhalla, 1987, p. 26) is a rewording of Statement 10. The low rating of this statement and Statement 16, reworded from the literature as "School library media specialists understand how knowledge is most effectively communicated by

teachers and most effectively received by students" (Walker, 1988, p. 21), cause concern that the role of the "master teacher" or "teacher-librarian" is not the norm in the DeKalb schools.

However, the ratings of the statements drawn from Loertscher's taxonomy do offer hope.

> Although most studies have shown little interest on the part of the library media specialists to engage in instructional development, and many have been quite negative about the role, these data suggest that, while much progress is still needed, inroads are being made toward changing the role of the library media specialist in the schools. (Loertscher, Ho, & Bowie, 1987, p. 149)

The same can be said about the instructional role in the DeKalb County media centers.

The most obvious question raised by this study is the reason for the discrepancy between the Interactive labels for importance and practice. This study did not attempt to determine the cause. The literature offered several reasons found in other studies. These included: a lack of interest, knowledge, and/or training of the library media specialist; a lack of administrative support which would include clerical, budgetary, and scheduling factors; and a lack of teacher interest, a resistance to cooperation, or their lack of information about the instructional design process. Further studies are needed to determine why more media specialists who feel it is important are not practicing the instructional role to its fullest extent. A replication of this study with other public school systems

in Georgia could be useful to see how the DeKalb library media specialists rank in comparison to their overall instructional rating.

Applications

The results of this study indicate that the majority of the DeKalb library media specialists perceive the importance of the instructional role. However, more needs to be done to influence their practice of the role. Investigation might be made to determine the reason for the discrepancy between perceived importance and practice. Then steps could be taken to rectify the situation, if it is in the realm of possibility.

The emphasis placed on the instructional role at the county level is certainly justified according to the literature. The success of "Helping Teachers Teach" can be measured to some extent by this study, but it is evident that the emphasis should continue. Inservice programs and staff development training in the different aspects, such as developing resource-based instructional units, might be developed not only for the library media specialists but also for classroom teachers. Administrators might also be advised about the importance of the instructional role. Their support is mandatory if the role is to reach its highest potential.

Conclusion

"There is relatively little danger to the continued existence of school libraries. The issue is the continued existence of the school librarian" (Haycock, 1985, p. 102). Information Power, the newest standards for the school library media specialist, defines the school librarian as information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant, giving equal importance to the three roles. Teacher and instructional consultant go hand in hand. An instructional consultant must have the knowledge, expertise, and experience of a teacher with added knowledge of the total collection of the media center and other resources outside the media center which relate to and enhance the curriculum. Library media specialists "should bring their knowledge of research, teaching methodology, curriculum development, learning theory, and instructional development to the process of teaching" (Hortin, 1985, p. 20). Thus, the teacher-librarian, the term used in Canada, is required to be a master teacher. The literature goes further in applying the terms instructional leader and instructional innovator to the library media specialist. Do the DeKalb library media specialists meet the standards? Perhaps not yet, but they certainly appear to be on the right track.

REFERENCES

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (1988). Information power: Guidelines for school library media programs. Chicago and Washington, DC: American Library Association and Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (1975). Media programs: Distict and school. Chicago: American Library Association.

Baker, D. P. (1984). The library media program and the school. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Bhalla, P. (1987). Modeling a library media-classroom integrated instructional process. School Library Media Activities Monthly, 4(1), 26-27.

Callison, D. (1984). Justification for action in the future school library media programs. School Library Media Quarterly, 12, 205-211.

Callison, D. (1987). Evaluator and educator: The school media specialist. TechTrends, 32(5), 24-29.

Casey, S. (1984). Theory--Where is my reality? Emergency Librarian, 14(3), 21-24.

Christensen, P. M. (1986). Profiles of eighteen Washington State high school library media specialists with exemplary programs (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 11A.

Cleaver, B. P., & Taylor, W. D. (1983). Involving the school library media specialist in curriculum development (School Media Centers, Focus on Trends and Issues, Monograph No. 8). Chicago: American Library Association.

Craver, K. W. (1986). The changing instructional role of the high school library media specialist: 1950-84. School Library Media Quarterly, 14, 183-191.

Crowell, A. (1985). The expectations and needs of teachers, students, and administrators for media services at Fairplay Middle School. Unpublished Educational Specialist research study, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Eisenberg, M. (1987, May). Changing roles of the media specialist. ERIC Digest, Report No. IR012775. Syracuse, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 532)

Fitzgerald, R. F. C. (1985). Participation by the school library media specialist in curriculum development in selected Michigan high schools (expectations, principals). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 11A. (University Microfilms No. 86-00443)

Goodlad, J. I. (1983). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Griffin, D. J., & Lamb, J. A. (1987). Positive relationships produce positive results. School Library Journal, 34(3), 27-29.

Haycock, K. (1985). Strengthening the foundations for teacher-librarians. School Library Media Quarterly, 13, 102-109.

Haycock, K. (1989). Research in teacher-librarianship: The implications for professional practice. Emergency Librarian, 17(1), 9-17, 35.

Henri, J. (1987). The integrated approach to school library programming. Emergency Librarian, 14(3), 9-14.

Hortin, J. A. (1985). The changing role of the school media specialist. TechTrends, 30(6), 20-21.

Johnson, K. A. (1981). Instructional development in schools: A proposed model. School Media Quarterly, 9, 256-271.

Kimmelbein, C. J. (1989). The choice to change: Establishing an integrated school library media program. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Liesner, J. W. (1985). Learning at risk: School library media programs in an information world. School Library Media Quarterly, 14, 11-20.

Loertscher, D. V. (1982). Second revolution: A taxonomy for the 1980's. Wilson Library Bulletin, 56, 417-421.

Loertscher, D. V. (1988). Taxonomies of the school library media program. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Loertscher, D. V., Ho, M. L., & Bowie, M. M. (1987). "Exemplary elementary schools" and their library media centers: A research report. School Library Media Quarterly, 15, 147-153.

Naylor, A. P., & Jenkins, K. D. (1988). An investigation of principals' perceptions of library media specialists' performance evaluation terminology. School Library Media Quarterly, 16, 234-241.

Nickel, M. L. (1984). Steps to service: A handbook of procedures for the school library media center. Chicago: American Library Association.

Patrick, R. (1988). Effect of certain reporting techniques on instructional involvement of library media specialists. In D. V. Loertscher (Ed.), Measures of excellence for school library media centers (pp. 52-67). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Patrick, R. B. (1989). Information Power: The planning process. School Library Media Quarterly, 17, 88a-88j.

Pretlow, D. Z. (1987). School libraries: A time for change. School Library Journal, 34(2), 48.

Roggenbuck, M. J. (1985). Curriculum involvement: Choices and challenges for the school library media specialist. Catholic Library World, 57, 125-132.

Smith, C. E. (1988). Critical incidents of library media services in an urban, multicampus school district (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 02A.

Staples, E. S. (1981). 60 competency ratings for school media specialists. Instructional Innovator, 26(8), 19-23.

Stripling, B. (1984). What price ID? A practical approach to a personal dilemma. School Library Media Quarterly, 12, 290-296.

Stripling, B. (1989). Rethinking the school library: A practitioner's perspective. School Library Media Quarterly, 17, 136-139.

Taylor, L. (1985). A study of the role of the school library media specialist as perceived by classroom teachers and media specialists. Unpublished Educational Specialist research study, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Tewel, K. J., & Kroll, C. (1988). Empowerment for the school library media specialist: Moving from reactive to proactive. School Library Media Quarterly, 16, 244-248.

Toor, R., & Weisburg, H. K. (1989). Reasons, roles and realities: A hands-on seminar in resource based instruction. Berkeley Heights, NJ: Library Learning Resources, Inc.

Turner, P. M. (1985). A school library media specialist's role: Helping teachers teach. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Turner, P. M. (1987). Research on helping teachers teach. School Library Media Quarterly, 15, 229-231.

Turner, P. M. (Ed.). (1988a). A casebook for "helping teachers teach". Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Turner, P. M. (1988b). In-service and the school library media specialist: What works and what doesn't. School Library Media Quarterly, 16, 106-109.

Waddle, L. (1988). School media matters. Wilson Library Bulletin, 63(4), 78-79.

Walker, S. (1988). Information Power: The role of the school library media specialist. School Library Media Quarterly, 17, 21-23.

Wehmeyer, L. B. (1987). Indirect leadership: The library media specialist as consigliere. School Library Media Quarterly, 15, 200-204.

Whitney, K. A. (1988). Information Power: An overview--Building library media programs for the future. School Library Media Quarterly, 17, 7-10.

Williams, J. S. (1989). Teacher/media specialist cooperation and service within middle school media centers. Unpublished Educational Specialist research study, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Winstead, J. B. (1987). The roles of the media specialist as perceived by college educators, systems directors, and school library media specialists. Unpublished Educational Specialist research study, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Woolls, B. (1988). Managing school library media programs. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please rate the following statements as you perceive their importance to your role as a school library media specialist using this scale

    1. of no importance
    2. of little importance
    3. of some importance
    4. important
    5. very important

_____ 1. Provide access to materials through organization and classification that integrate materials in all formats into a unified collection.

_____ 2. Provide reference services and materials to individual students and teachers.

_____ 3. Gather materials for a teacher with no advance notice.

_____ 4. Plan informally and briefly with a teacher for library involvement in a unit.

_____ 5. Gather materials requested by a teacher in advance of a class project or assignment.

_____ 6. Promote the instructional philosophy of the library media center program.

_____ 7. Plan formally with teachers to supply materials or activities in response to a teacher-planned unit.

_____ 8. Help teachers plan, implement, and evaluate instructional units where library media center materials are supplementary or used for enrichment.

_____ 9. Help teachers plan, implement, and evaluate, instructional units where the entire content is based on resources and activities of the library media center program.

_____ 10. Participate as an equal partner with the teacher in assessing students' achievements (grading) in a resource-based unit.

_____ 11. Participate as a member of the school curriculum committee.

_____ 12. Design and produce instructional materials to meet student and teacher needs.

_____ 13. Analyze and interpret content of instructional materials in relation to the curriculum.

_____ 14. Design and conduct inservice education programs for teachers, aids, and other school-related groups.

_____ 15. Explain various styles of learning that account for individual differences among students.

_____ 16. Use information, communication, and learning theories and models in relation to learning styles and individual differences among students.

_____ 17. Identify appropriate usage of various communication media in the learning environment.

_____ 18. Assist and guide teachers and students in the design, development, and evaluation of instructional programs in relation to learner needs, teacher strategies, and learning environments.

II. Rate the extent to which you practice the following roles using the scale below:

1. not at all
2. to a small extent
3. to a moderate extent
4. to a great extent
5. to a very great extent

_____ 1. Provide access to materials through organization and classification that integrate materials in all formats into a unified collection.

_____ 2. Provide reference services and materials to individual students and teachers.

_____ 3. Gather materials for a teacher with no advance notice.

_____ 4. Plan informally and briefly with a teacher for library involvement in a unit.

_____ 5. Gather materials requested by a teacher in advance of a class project or assignment.

_____ 6. Promote the instructional philosophy of the library media center program.

_____ 7. Plan formally with teachers to supply materials or activities in response to a teacher-planned unit.

_____ 8. Help teachers plan, implement, and evaluate instructional units where library media center materials are supplementary or used for enrichment.

_____ 9. Help teachers plan, implement, and evaluate, instructional units where the entire content is based on resources and activities of the library media center program.

_____ 10. Participate as an equal partner with the teacher in assessing students' achievements (grading) in a resource-based unit.

_____ 11. Participate as a member of the school curriculum committee.

_____ 12. Design and produce instructional materials to meet student and teacher needs.

_____ 13. Analyze and interpret content of instructional materials in relation to the curriculum.

_____ 14. Design and conduct inservice education programs for teachers, aids, and other school-related groups.

_____ 15. Explain various styles of learning that account for individual differences among students.

_____ 16. Use information, communication, and learning theories and models in relation to learning styles and individual differences among students.

_____ 17. Identify appropriate usage of various communication media in the learning environment.

_____ 18. Assist and guide teachers and students in the design, development, and evaluation of instructional programs in relation to learner needs, teacher strategies, and learning environments.

III. Additional Information Needed.

19. Number of years experience as a classroom teacher _____

20. Number of years experience as a library media specialist _____

21. Present media center position (circle one)
Elementary Middle/Junior Secondary

22. Number of teaching faculty in your school _____

23. Highest degree held in library science (circle one)
Bachelor Masters Specialist Doctorate
Year received _____

24. Date of last formal (college) course in library science _____

25. Check the following education courses you have taken which would aid you in your instructional role:

_____ a. curriculum
_____ b. student learning styles
_____ c. methods of teaching
_____ d. test design
_____ e. communication skills
_____ f. production of instructional materials

26. List any professional organizations to which you belong._____
_____
_____

27. List any awards or honors you, your media center program and your school have received while you were the libray media specialist, such as Teacher of the Year, School of Excellence, etc.

_____
_____
_____

28. Are you an active member of your school's curriculum committee? _____

29. Have you ever served on a county/system curriculum committee? _____

RESPONDENTS' COMMENTS WELCOMED

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESPONSE TO THIS SURVEY. PLEASE RETURN IT TO ME IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE BY DECEMBER 20, 1989.

Appendix B

The Library Media Specialist's Taxonomy

1. NO INVOLVEMENT
   The library media center is bypassed entirely.

2. SELF-HELP WAREHOUSE
   Facilities and materials are available for the self-starter.

3. INDIVIDUAL REFERENCE ASSISTANCE
   Students or teachers retrieve requested information or materials for specific needs.

4. SPONTANEOUS INTERACTION AND GATHERING
   Spur-of-the-moment activities and gathering of materials occur with no advance notice.

5. CURSORY PLANNING
   Informal and brief planning with teachers and students for library media center involvement—usually done in the hall, the teachers' lounge, the lunchroom, etc. (Here's an idea for an activity and new materials to use. Have you seen...? Can I get you a film?)

6. PLANNED GATHERING
   Gathering of materials is done in advance of class project upon teacher request.

7. EVANGELISTIC OUTREACH
   A concerted effort is made to promote the philosophy of the library media center program.

8. SCHEDULED PLANNING IN THE SUPPORT ROLE
   Formal planning is done with a teacher or group of students to supply materials or activities for a previously planned resource-based teaching unit or project.

9. INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN, LEVEL I
   The library media specialist participates in every step of the development, execution, and evaluation of a resource-based teaching unit. LMC involvement is considered as enrichment or as supplementary.

10. INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN, LEVEL II
    The library media center staff participates in resource-based teaching units where the entire unit content depends on the resources and activities of the LMC program.

11. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
    Along with other educators, the library media specialist contributes to the planning and structure of what will actually be taught in the school or district.

Fig. 3.1. The library media specialist's taxonomy.

From: Loertscher, D. V. (1988). Taxonomies of the School Library Media Programs. Englewood, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited.

Appendix C

Cover Letter

KENNETH HENNESSY
PRINCIPAL

ROBERT R. FREEMAN
SUPERINTENDENT

DeKalb County School System
SEQUOYAH JR. HIGH SCHOOL
3456 Aztec Drive
Doraville, Georgia 30340
451-3821

December 5, 1989

Dear Colleague,

I am conducting a study to determine if a gap exists between the theoretical instructional role of the library media specialist as defined in the professional literature and standards and that actually practiced by school library media specialists. To gather the needed data, I have designed the enclosed survey questionnaire dealing with the perception and practice of the instructional role. I have attached a self-addressed, stamped envelope for returning the questionnaire to guarantee strict anonymity. Please return the questionnaire to me by December 20, 1989.

This study, part of the requirements for a Specialist degree in Library Media Technology at Georgia State University, should be helpful to all of us as we struggle to define the many facets of our role as library media specialists. A summary of the results will be available in the spring.

Thank you for participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Patricia W. Pickard

Patricia W. Pickard
Library Media Specialist

"THE SCHOOL CANNOT LIVE APART FROM THE COMMUNITY"

Appendix D

THE LOERTSCHER TAXONOMY DIVIDED INTO PHILOSOPHICAL CATEGORIES OF INSTRUCTIONAL INVOLVEMENT*

REACTIVE

Level One. No involvement: the library media center is bypassed entirely. There is no attempt to become involved in a particular instructional sequence or unit.

Level Two. Self-help warehouse: facilities and materials are available for the self-starter.

Level Three. Individual reference assistance: students and teachers get requested information or materials for specific needs.

Level Four. Spontaneous interaction and gathering of spur-of-the-moment activities and gathering of materials occur with no advance notice.

Level Five. Cursory planning: informal and brief planning with teachers and students for library media center involvement.

PROACTIVE

Level Six. Planned gathering of materials done in advance of a project upon teacher request.

Level Seven. Evangelistic outreach: a concerted effort is made to promote the miltimedia individualized instructional philosophy.

Level Eight. Scheduled planning in support role: formal planning is done with a teacher or group of students to supply materials or activities in response to a previously planned unit or project.

INTERACTIVE

Level Nine. Instructional design, Interactive Level: the library media specialist participates in every step of the development, execution and evaluation of an instructional unit, but there is still some detachment from the unit.

Level Ten. Instructional design, Evaluative Level: the library media center professional participates in grading students and feels an equal responsibility with the teacher for their achievement.

Level Eleven. Curriculum development: along with other educators, the library media specialist contributes to the planning and structure of what will actually be taught in the school district.

* From: Callison, D. (1987). Justification for action in the future school library media program. School Library Media Quarterly, 12, 205-211.

Appendix E

RESPONDENTS' COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

Administrators and teachers need to be made aware of the resources which we have and the assistance we are trained to provide. Many teachers have out-dated ideas about what a school media center can do.

[Explain various styles of learning that account for individual differences among students] important information, but needs to come from administrators or supervisors, not us.

[Statements #15 and #16] assistant principal's job.

I am not yet convinced that it is, or should be my role to participate broadly in planning, implementing and evaluating teaching units. This seems a logistical impossibility to effect with dozens of teachers and hundreds of students simultaneously. Lead teachers are specifically trained in that realm and are people who probably sought such a role from the beginning. I didn't.

A curriculum committee does not exist in my school. The curriculum is determined at the county level and more and more at the state level with O.B.E..

The term instructional consultant as it applies to the library media specialist is too broadly defined. I do not feel that I have the training, knowledge, or expertise to carry out the role to its fullest definition. Instructional lead teachers [ILT] and assistant principals for instruction have the credentials and job description as true instructional consultants. They do not have the added responsibility of management of a library media center.

The administrative responsibilities require so mush time and effort that teaching tends to fall by the wayside.

I'm not sure why librarians should know more about learning styles than teachers. What is the lead teacher's or the lead teacher for students' services [LTSS] role if we are doing curriculum planning and telling teachers how they should be running their classes?

I think it is important to keep in mind that even if a media specialist does not do one of the areas mentioned, or even think it is of any importance, that does not mean it's of little importance. We need to be continually motivated to reach for new goals, try different methods, take on new responsibilities, etc. Some media specialists have "tunnel vision," and we all can come up with more jobs to do than time allows, but are the jobs really important or are they the ones most expedient? Where should our priorities be? Change is hard for all of us, but necessary if we are to improve the job we've been hired to do.

I seem to view my role differently than the prescribed thinking. I am a resource person, not an instructional innovator. I have no role in planning curriculum - that comes from the state and county. I cannot promote the instructional philosophy of a media center program - I promote the instructional

philosophy of the school. I am also tied to an instructional method not my choosing. I cannot promote something I don't believe in, and am trying to change.

I don't understand the sudden interest in resource-based units among DeKalb media specialists. Master teachers have been utilizing resource-based units for many, many years. No one has acted as their "equal partner" to grade their students' work. This is a totally impractical idea.

[Design and produce instructional materials to meet student and teachers needs.] I provide equipment and supplies and idea resources for teachers to produce instructional materials, but not make them for teachers and students.

[Design and conduct inservice education programs for teachers, aids, and other school-related groups.] I don't have the authority to do this. This is the role of principal, ILT, lead teacher for student services, instructional coordinator. Of course, I do this on occasion when the inservice pertains to the library media center program or when asked to conduct inservices by principal or person in authority.

This is my first year back in a media center after a ten year absence. I took the place of a much loved media specialist who was transferred, and it's taking time to win the staff's confidence. If I had answered based on my old school, there would have been more 4's and 5's further down the page on page 2. Good luck to you!

The things I do at work that are not part of the role of a media specialist are what burn me out and use me up. Our school needs a paraprofessional just to deal with parent's requests and suggestions. Guess who does it now?

[Statement #15] ILT's job. Member of "leadership" committee, not curriculum committee.

[Statements #15 and #16] I'm not qualified, but this might be important.

The discrepancy in importance and practice is mainly due to the fact that we have over 1100 students and still only one media specialist. Things rated high in importance are goals set aside for the time when we have more help.

No. [member of your school's curriculum committee] Principal selects the committee.

No. [member of your school's curriculum committee] Never been asked, would do so if invited.

There is not enough time to be a "5" on all counts. Teachers are not willing to spare the time for some of this planning. Plus many are not willing to give up their "domain." Some of this falls under the ILT's or assistant principal in charge of instruction's jurisdiction.

[Participate as an equal partner with the teacher in assessing student's achievements (grading) in a resourced-based unit] The important thing is doing our part in making sure the material is taught well and that the students understand.

The theoretical instructional role of the library media specialist is not always practical or realistic in our situation.

Although we do not have a formal curriculum committee, I do work with teachers, principal, and lead teacher when local curriculum decisions are made.

As a new media specialist, I am finding it difficult to implement "new" ways and ideas. Hopefully, I will be more involved with the instructional process in the future.

I endorse and practice to some degree all 18 points, but staff and teachers are limited by time. All teachers are not committed to resource-based teaching, at least in practice. Staff must be increased with paraprofessionals if media specialists are to be able to check 4 and 5 on rate of extent. Good survey questionnaire!

[Sixteen respondents commented on the queationnaire in places other than the Comment section or indicated in some way that their school did not have a curriculum committee.]